	•	
From:		additional Connect
Sent:	Thursday, February 15, 2018 11:10 AM	
To	Factorling Dehorah	

RE: SCE&G Dominion proposal - upcoming public meeting

Ms. Easterling,

Subject:

This "prudence" thing is massively "vague". It would -not be prudent- to allow investors to profit from a failed project ever!!

Further, if SC legislatures had or have investments in the SCANA, that, in it self, should make the Base Load review act illegal by conflict of interest !!!

If the Base load review act is invalid, then the PSC should not be able to simply fall back on the BLRA as their basis of a prudence decision, just because the law says SCE&G is allowed to raise their rates.

No rate increases, to support a NEW project such as V.C. Summer project, should be used to increase profits ever !!! That is what these rate increases do !!!

It appears to me that the PSC feels SCANA investors should not have to make for their mistakes. They invested on a gamble, and they lost. Their investments should not increase or stay constant when they lose a gamble!!

- ---- "Easterling wrote:

 > Dear Mr. Matthews,

 >

 >

 > This is to acknowledge receipt of your emailed correspondence/comments to the Public Service Commission of South Carolina.

 > >
- > You requested information as to whether the Commission has "investigated whether any current or past SC legislature are or were shareholders in SCANA or SCE&G stock". The Commission has not and does not carry out such investigations. It is not within the jurisdiction given to the Commission by the Legislature.
- > Your correspondence/comments will be placed in the Docket Listed below and on the Commission's Website at www.psc.sc.gov<http://www.psc.sc.gov>:
 - Docket No. Docket No. 2017-370-

> >

> >

E<a href="E<a hr